

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended, and claims 4, 7, 11, 14, 17, and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 18-19 remain in the application for prosecution on the merits. Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph:

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 15 in accordance with the examiner's recommendation to clarify that the pair of shoes are adapted to be seated in respective pockets. Accordingly, claim 15, and claims 16, 18 and 19 which depend therefrom, are now believed to be acceptable to the examiner, and applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) or § 102(b):

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamura 6,158,968. Also, claims 5, 12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nakamura (6,158,968). Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended in accordance with the allowable subject matter, as discussed below.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 7 and 14 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, claim 20 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the section 112 rejection and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations

10/01/2004 10:47

7345429569


of claim 7, claim 8 was amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 14, and claim 15 was amended to overcome the section 112 rejection as well as incorporate the limitations of claim 20. Thus, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are believed to be patentable over the cited art, as well as dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-10, 12-13, 16, and 18-19, which each ultimately depend from one of the allowable independent claims. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests that all of the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In summary, the Applicant believes that each formal and substantive requirement has now been met. Applicant respectfully requests the examiner withdraw all of the rejections. The case is now believed to be in appropriate form for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application or resolve any further questions, such a call is invited to Applicant's attorney, whose direct line is (734) 542-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 1, 2004

By: 
Donald A. Wilkinson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,410

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900